## REMARKS

Claims 18-24, 30, 48-64 are pending in this application. Claims 62 and 63 are amended.

Claims 62 and 63 are amended to change "a laundry receiving area" to "the laundry receiving area", which provides proper antecedent basis for this term.

The following arguments are in addition to those arguments made in the previously filed Amendment E. The arguments made in Amendment E are reasserted herein but, in the interest of clarity, not all of the arguments made in Amendment E are reproduced herein.

### The Smith Reference

Claims 18, 20-24 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,287,817 to Smith. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In its Response to Arguments section, the Office Action discusses 35 USC §112, sixth paragraph, and the required disclosure. Because the Office Action does not include a rejection based on 35 USC §112, second paragraph, Applicants understand that there are no disclosure issues in the application. Applicants do not understand what, if any, relevance the Office Action's citing of authority regarding computer related means plus function claims has to the present application. As a result, Applicants have no response to that portion of the Office Action.

The Office Action asserts that the electrodes 80, 81 of Smith meet the claim limitations because they are placed on insulated vane 66 with water absorptive material 82 between the electrodes. And that water absorptive material 82 thermally insulates and keeps cooling moisture around the electrodes in order to reduce the temperature of the electrodes. Applicants disagree with these assertions.

Claim 18 includes the feature of means for heat reduction from at least a part of at least one of the electrodes, the means for heat reduction operating to reduce a temperature of the part

of the at least one electrode below a temperature of the respective receiving area of the laundry dryer.

The water absorptive material 82 placed below electrodes 80, 81 cannot serve to cool the electrodes. This water absorptive material 82 is simply applied to accumulate humidity in proportion to the humidity content of the textiles to be dried. As the water absorptive material is confined to the immediate surroundings of the electrodes, it will have a temperature equal to the temperature of the interior of the drier and the electrodes. No cooling effect will exist.

Further, Applicants submit that Smith does not disclose any means for heat reduction that reduces a temperature of any part of an electrode below a temperature of the receiving area of that electrode on the dryer. Even if impeller member 76 of Smith could be considered a means for heat reduction (and Applicants submit that it cannot) there is no indication that impeller member 76 would reduce the temperature of a part of the electrode below a temperature of the area to which that electrode is mounted (its receiving area).

Smith has nothing to do with cooling electrodes. The purpose of Smith is to reduce the likelihood of premature shut off of the drying operation by keeping the moisture content of the material 82 placed near the electrodes similar to that of the interior of fabrics being dried (col. 3, lines 39-41).

The electrodes of Smith do not have any heat transfer channel available that could be used to take heat from the electrodes so as to bring their temperature down to below the temperature of their immediate surroundings. Such function necessarily requires something such as a heat transfer channel independent from the immediate surroundings and capable of bringing more heat away from the electrodes than the immediate surroundings could bring into them. As Smith has nothing, such as a heat transfer channel, assigned to the electrodes shown, the electrodes can only, and will only, be brought to a temperature which equates to the temperature of their immediate surroundings. Thus, Smith cannot be said to disclose any means functional and operable to bring the temperatures of the electrodes down to a temperature below the temperature of their immediate surroundings.

In its Response to Arguments section, the Office Action asserts that "the argued temperature below the receiving area feature is inherent because as the electrodes spin inside the drum on the vane, the airflow past the fane (sic) provides a lowering temperature effect since the rotation allows moving air to keep the temperature below the receiving area." Applicants submit that this logic is flawed. The respective receiving area to which each electrode is fixed will be subjected to the same air flow to which the electrode is subjected. As a result, the temperature of the electrode will not be reduced below a temperature of the respective receiving area, as is required by claim 18.

Claims 55, 56, 58 and 60-64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 55, 56, 58 and 60 ultimately depend from claim 18. For at least the reasons discussed above, Smith does not teach or suggest the features of claim 18.

Claim 56 includes the feature of the device being operable to reduce the heat of the respective one electrode to a level at which the respective one electrode substantially avoids evaporating liquid entrained in a liquid-air mixture in the interior of the laundry receiving area. Smith makes no mention of avoiding the evaporation of liquid on an electrode.

Claim 60 includes the feature of the means for heat reduction operating to reduce heat from the first electrode such that the exposed side of the first electrode is substantially prevented from reaching the evaporation enabling temperature. Smith makes no mention of preventing an electrode from reaching an evaporation enabling temperature.

Claims 61-64 ultimately depend from claim 48. Claim 48 includes the features of an electrode of a moisture sensor fixed to a respective receiving area of the laundry dryer; and a cooler that cools the electrode, the cooler operating to reduce a temperature of the electrode below a temperature of the respective receiving area of the laundry dryer.

As discussed above with regard to the rejection of claim 18, The water absorptive material 82 placed below electrodes 80, 81 of Smith cannot serve to cool the electrodes. This water absorptive material 82 is simply applied to accumulate humidity in proportion to the

humidity content of the textiles to be dried. As the water absorptive material is confined to the immediate surroundings of the electrodes, it will have a temperature equal to the temperature of the interior of the drier and the electrodes. No cooling effect will exist.

Further, Applicants submit that Smith does not disclose any cooler that reduces a temperature of an electrode below a temperature of the receiving area of that electrode on the dryer. Even if impeller member 76 of Smith could be considered a cooler (and Applicants submit that it cannot) there is no indication that impeller member 76 would reduce the temperature of the electrode below a temperature of the area to which that electrode is mounted (its receiving area).

Smith has nothing to do with cooling electrodes. The purpose of Smith is to reduce the likelihood of premature shut off of the drying operation by keeping the moisture content of the material 82 placed near the electrodes similar to that of the interior of fabrics being dried (col. 3, lines 39-41).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Smith does not teach or suggest the features of claims 18, 20-24, 30, 55, 56, 58 and 60-64. As a result, the rejections should be withdrawn.

**The Frye Reference**

Claims 48 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,511,839 to Frye. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 48 includes the features of an electrode of a moisture sensor fixed to a respective receiving area of the laundry dryer; and a cooler that cools the electrode, the cooler operating to reduce a temperature of the electrode below a temperature of the respective receiving area of the laundry dryer.

Applicants reassert that the Office Action has misinterpreted the purpose and function of the ring electrodes 54, 55 of Frye. Ring electrodes 54, 55 subject the clothes within the drum of

the dryer to a high frequency electric field to dry the clothes (col. 1, lines 28-30; col. 5, lines 1-2). Frye does not disclose or even suggest that ring electrodes 54, 55 in any way sense moisture.

Further, Applicants reassert that Frye does not disclose any means for heat reduction that reduces a temperature of any part of an electrode below a temperature of the receiving area of that electrode on the dryer.

Applicants submit that claim 51 cannot be anticipated by Frye because claim 51 depends from claims 49 and 50, and claims 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), not 35 U.S.C. §102. The Office Action specifically states that features of claims 50 and 49 are not disclosed by Frye. As a result, claim 51 (which includes the features of claims 49 and 50) cannot be anticipated by Frye.

Claim 62 includes the feature of the respective receiving area of the electrode being located in a laundry receiving area of the dryer. Claim 51 ultimately depends from claim 62. The Office Action does not address this feature of claim 51. Applicants point out that ring electrodes 54, 55 of Frye are, in any event, located outside the drum (Figs. 1, 2) and therefore not in a laundry receiving area of the dryer.

Claims 49, 50, 52, 53, 57 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Frye. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 49, 50, 52, 53, 57 and 61 ultimately depend from claim 48. For at least the reasons discussed above, Frye does not suggest the features of claim 48.

In addition, claims 49, 50, 52, 53, 57 and 61 ultimately depend from claim 62. Claim 62 includes the feature of the respective receiving area of the electrode being located in a laundry receiving area of the dryer. In contrast, ring electrodes 54, 55 of Frye are not located in the laundry receiving area of the dryer.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Frye does not teach or suggest the features of claims 48-53, 57 and 61. As a result, the rejections should be withdrawn.

**The Frye Reference in view of the Kelm Reference**

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Frye in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,141,957 to Kelm. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 19 depends from claim 18. Applicants submit that even if Kelm was available as a reference, which Applicants submit it is not, Kelm does not remedy the deficiencies of Frye discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18.

Applicants submit that Kelm is not available to the Examiner for use in a rejection because Kelm is clearly non-analogous art. "[A] prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*" (emphasis original, M.P.E.P. § 707.07(f). Kelm is neither within the field of Applicants' endeavor nor reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Applicants were concerned.

The field of Applicants' endeavor is the laundry dryer art. In stark contrast, the field of endeavor of Kelm is the electrical connection art. One of ordinary skill in the art who is in the field of the laundry dryer art would not have been familiar with, nor have looked to Kelm because Kelm is directed to the completely different and unrelated field of electrical connections. Kelm is not within the field of Applicants' endeavor.

Kelm is also not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Applicants were concerned. As clearly explained by the specification at, for example, page 2, lines 12-20, the Applicants were concerned with the problem of preventing layer build-up on electrodes in a laundry dryer. In stark contrast, Kelm is concerned with the completely different and unrelated problem of effecting electrical connections among a plurality of units (col. 1, lines 9-10). One of ordinary skill in the art who was concerned with the problem of preventing layer build-up on electrodes in a laundry dryer, as the Applicants were concerned, would not have referred to Kelm because it is directed to the completely different and unrelated problem of effecting electrical connections among a plurality of units. Indeed, Kelm has absolutely nothing to do with the

problem of preventing layer build-up on electrodes in a laundry dryer. Thus, Kelm is not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Applicants were concerned.

Applicants submit that Kelm is neither within the field of Applicants' endeavor nor reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the Applicants were concerned and, as such, is non-analogous art and therefore, unavailable for use in rejecting the claims.

In the present instance, the Examiner clearly did not locate Kelm during a search for relevant art that was within the field of applicants' endeavor or reasonably related to the particular problem which the applicants were concerned. It appears that Kelm was located through a keyword search.

The Office Action states that it would have been obvious "to combine the teachings of Frye with opposite electrodes, as disclosed in Turetta, for the purpose of optimizing means of removing undesirable heat in a laundry drying operation with a dual fan operating system." Applicants are confused by this statement. First, in an attempt to respond to the rejection, Applicants will assume that the Examiner meant Kelm instead of Turetta. Second, claim 19 does not address anything to do with "opposite electrodes". Claim 19 includes the feature of the means for heat reduction being arranged on a rear side of the electrodes opposite to a side of the electrodes that face a laundry receiving area of the dryer. Third, claim 19 does not have anything to do with a dual fan operating system.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the combination of Frye and Kelm does not suggest the features of claim 19. As a result, the rejections should be withdrawn.

**The Frye Reference in view of the Turetta Reference**

Claim 54 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Frye in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,228,212 to Turetta. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 54 ultimately depends from claim 48 and claim 62. Applicants submit that Turetta does not remedy the deficiencies of Frye discussed above with respect to the rejections of claims 48 and 62.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the combination of Frye and Turetta does not suggest the features of claim 54. As a result, the rejections should be withdrawn.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request entry of the present Amendment and allowance of claims 18-24, 30, 48-64. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Respectfully submitted,

/James E. Howard/

James E. Howard
Registration No. 39,715
September 28, 2010

BSH Home Appliances Corporation
100 Bosch Blvd.
New Bern, NC 28562
Phone: 252-639-7644
Fax: 714-845-2807
james.howard@bshg.com